

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



DATE MAILED: 01/08/2003

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/208,962	12/10/1998	RICHARD A. ELCO	4414-D	8858
7	590 01/08/2003			
BRIAN J HAMILLA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY			EXAMINER	
10	ECTRONICS GROUP II	NC	EXAMINER ABRAMS, NEIL ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	S, NEIL
825 OLD TRAIL RD ETTERS, PA 17319		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Di ibio, i ii	.,,,,		2839	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	Examiner A60	ams Group Art Unit 2839	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears o	n the cover sheet be	neath the correspondence add	tress—
Period for Reply	7		
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO I OF THIS COMMUNICATION.			
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replet to the period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, and the period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statused and reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	ly within the statutory mini expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to	mum of thirty (30) days will be consident the mailing date of this communicate become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. §	ered timely. tion. 133).
Status Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12-13-	02 RCE	and prelim	andt
☐ This action is FIMAL.			
 Since this application is in condition for allowance except for accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935. 	or formal matters, pros C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.	secution as to the merits is cl	osed in
Disposition of Claims			
Disposition of Claims Claim(s) 46 - 64		is/are pending in the appl	ication.
Of the above claim(s)		is/are withdrawn from cor	nsideration.
□ Claim(s)		is/are allowed.	
Claim(s) 70 76 1		is/are rejected.	
□ Claim(s)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	is/are objected to.	'-1
□ Claim(s)		requirement	or election
Application Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is □ approved	□ disapproved.	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are object		,	
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	32.6 3, 4.6 2.2		
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority us □ All □ Some* □ None of the: □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been re □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been re □ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents in this national stage application from the International *Certified copies not received:	eceived. eceived in Application is s have been received Bureau (PCT Rule 17.5	No	
Attachment(s)			
[*] □ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No	(s)	Intervi w Summary, PTO-413	
Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892		Notice f Informal Pat nt Applic	ation, PTO-152
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948	3 -	Other	
Office Ac	ction Summary		*

Application/Control Number: 09/208,962

Art Unit: 2839

The filing of a request for continued examination is noted. A first action follows.

Claims 46-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 46, 51, 56, 61 are unclear and just how each one is readable on the disclosed devices is unclear.

Nor do the terms use find clear basis in the disclosure especially with regard to detailed embodiments of figs. 4-33. Readability and basis, if shown only for figs 1-3 does not seem adequate since these figures, as best understood, relate to theory and not to practical embodiments.

Claims 46-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are unclear, for claim 1, and others insofar as they differ from claim 1, just how limitations read on disclosed devices must be explained.

Claims 46-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Fedder alone or in view of Kandibowski, Swamy, Teka, Johary and Apap.

The claims are treated in so far as understood. Ground planes 112, 60 surround conductors 102, 54 with dielectric between ground planes and conductors. For claims 48-50, etc.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 09/208,962

Art Unit: 2839

Obvious to use solder attachments in view of Seidler, Romine, Apap, Swamy, Teka and Johary.

As alternative obvious to form Fedder system for surface mount to the pcb as in Kandibowski and to use solder connections in view of references noted above.

Claims 46-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Mosquera alone or taken in view of Seidler and Swamy.

Note fig. 5, ground planes 56, 110, 54, etc that surround conductors 72, etc. Also obvious to use solder connections as in Seidler and Swamy.

Claims 46-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korsunsky in view of Mosquera, Seidler, Swamy and Romine.

Ground planes 70, 170 are noted. Also obvious to add further shield (ground planes) as in Mosquera, fig. 5 at 56, 110, 56, etc and for claims 48-50 etc to use solder as in Seidler, Swamy and Romine.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to N. Abrams at telephone number (703) 308-1729.

Abrams/ek

12/27/02

EXAMINER ART UNIT 322